



Citizens' Water Advisory Committee
P.O. Box 27210
Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210
(520) 791-4213
(520) 791-2639 (TDD)
(520) 791-4017 (FAX)

Citizens' Water Advisory Committee

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the Citizens' Water Advisory Committee was called to order by Francis Boyle, Chair, on Wednesday, September 5, 2007, at 7:03 a.m., in the City Information Technology Building, 481 West Paseo Redondo, First Floor, Pueblo Conference Room, Tucson, Arizona.

1. Call to Order

Members Present:

Francis Boyle, Chair
Lori Lustig
Carol Zimmerman
Evan Canfield
Corina A. Baca
James T. Barry, Vice Chair
John R. Carhuff (arrived at 7:10 a.m.)
Sarah Evans
Ursula Kramer
Keith Gentzler
Martin M. Fogel (departed at 8:35 a.m.)

Appointed by:

Ward 3
Ward 1
Ward 2
Ward 6
Ward 5
City Manager
City Manager
City Manager
City Manager
City Manager
Mayor

Members Absent:

Robert Logan
Daniel Sullivan
James Horvath

Appointed by:

Ward 4
City Manager
City Manager

Others Present:

Tina Lee, Council Administrative Assistant, Ward 2
Holly Lachowicz, Council Administrative Assistant, Ward 3
David Modeer, Tucson Water Department Director
Bruce Johnson, Tucson Water Department Deputy Director
Marie Pearthree, Tucson Water Department Deputy Director
Barbara Buus, Tucson Water Management Coordinator
John Thomas, Tucson Water Management Coordinator
Trucynda Hawkins, Tucson Water Management Coordinator
Pat Eisenberg, Tucson Water Department Administrator
Jeff Biggs, Tucson Water Department Administrator

David Cormier, Tucson Water Department Administrator
Sandy Elder, Tucson Water Department Administrator
Ralph Marra, Tucson Water Department Administrator
Ray Wilson, Tucson Water Department Administrator
Melodee Loiper, Tucson Water
Diane Kusel, ADWR
Karen Masbu, COT-CN
John O'Hare, Tucson Water Department Staff Assistant
Karen Tenace, Budget Department Lead Analyst
Chris Avery, Principal Assistant City Attorney
Karen Wilson, Pima County Flood Control
Bill Richardson, Pima Co. Wastewater Dept. Sr. Administrative Services Mgr.
Joan Stauch, Tucson Water
Nancy Gradillas, Tucson Water
Belinda Oden, Tucson Water
Barbara Dildine, Tucson Water
Fernando Molina, Tucson Water
Tim Thomure, Tucson Water
Linda Smith, Tucson Water
Ralph Marra, Tucson, Water
Vince Vasquez, Diamond Ventures, Inc.
Ceci Sotomayor, Recording Secretary, City Clerk's Office
Tiki Lawson, Recording Secretary, City Clerk's Office

2. Call to Audience

No one spoke.

3. Approval of Minutes: June 6, 2007

Motion by Vice Chair Barry, duly seconded, and carried by a vote of 10 to 0 to approve the minutes as presented (Committee Members Carhuff, Logan, Sullivan and Horvath were absent).

4. Director's Report

a. Recent and Upcoming Mayor & Council Items

David Modeer, Tucson Water Director reported:

- Since the June 2007 CWAC meeting, the business plan was presented and discussed with the Mayor and Council. Real property purchases were approved for the La Paloma reclaim water reservoir facility and for the expansion of a booster station at Sabino Canyon and Snyder Roads. There was also an amendment to a ground water savings project with BKW Farms and approval of Tucson Water water conservation projects for the Smartscape homeowner and landscape training program, and Tucson Water's contribution to Project WET.

- Upcoming items for Mayor and Council approval included several easements for pipelines to serve existing customers and an amendment to a pre-annexation development agreement with the Kolb Road Business Park to clarify some divisions of water service in a business complex on the southern end of Kolb Road towards I-10.
- In June 2007, the Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD) Board of Directors considered property tax rates. The Central Arizona Project (CAP) was funded fifty percent by property taxes and fifty percent by water sales revenues. There was a movement to lower the tax rate that concluded with the property tax rate being lowered by two cents. It was hoped revenues would remain steady so water rates would not have to be raised.
- There was controversy with the Department of Water Resources (DWR) regarding well legislation. The DWR originally interpreted legislation differently than water providers in a three county region. The DWR had allowed people to drill wells in residential areas of the water providers' service areas. Tucson Water, as well as other water providers, protested this issue with the DWR and the DWR reversed their stance. Now the legislation was being interpreted so that the water provider denied the provision to drill a well.
- The Mayor and Council Strategic Focus Area Subcommittee - Environment, Planning and Resource Management Committee considered regional water supply activities at their August 7, 2007 meeting. Tucson Water was working with Avra Valley and Metro Water discussing the potential of wheeling their CAP allocations through Tucson Water's Avra Valley facilities. This was in the preliminary stages and it would take time to reach a conclusion on this matter.
- The August 2007, CAWCD Board of Directors meeting raised the issue of agricultural (ag) pool pricing. It was important because there was a substantial subsidy provided to the ag pool of excess water. There was about 400,000 acre-feet of water that would be set aside until approximately the year 2025 to which agricultural users had access to and paid a very low price for. In 2006, they paid forty dollars an acre foot. Agricultural users had wanted to have that lowered to thirty-five dollars but they compromised to pay thirty-six dollars an acre foot for one year. This was because any subsidy came out of other revenues like water sales revenues, which were paid by everyone. It was agreed the subsidy would come from the sale of sulfur dioxide credits from the electrical generating plant in Paige, AZ. The sale of those credits would offset the price reduction to the ag users and this would be discussed early next year as to whether or not any subsidy would continue in the future. It was recognized that forty dollars was already a substantial subsidy compared to the one hundred fourteen dollars everyone else paid for CAP water.
- It was almost nine months ago that the seven basin states reached an agreement which was submitted to the Secretary of the Interior for the operation of the Colorado River under shortage conditions. That was under

consideration as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process by the Secretary of the Interior. The State of Arizona sent a letter to the Secretary of the Interior asking for a process called 'consultation' which meant they were no longer in agreement. The seven states now had a disagreement and the outcome of it was unknown. If the Secretary of the Interior agreed to consultation on the issues under dispute, it would delay the release of the EIS and the record of decision by the Secretary of the Interior on the shortage criteria. The worst case scenario was that it could end up going to the Supreme Court next year. The best case scenario was the stakeholders would agree to interpretation of the language in the agreement which might be difficult to achieve because there are opposite opinions in the upper basin and lower basin states, particularly Arizona. The record of decision was supposed to come out in December and it had been delayed at least for 60 days.

b. Other items of interest

David Modeer, Director of Tucson Water reported:

- Marana had not yet addressed the agreement on effluent use with Tucson Water because they did not think they were subject to the Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement (SAWRSA). The Town of Marana's water utility was named in the lawsuit when it was filed. Every ground water pumper in this region was named in the original lawsuit. It was not a significant amount of water involved, but this had spilled over to the whole issue of Marana wanting to exercise their option in their intergovernmental agreement with Pima County to take over the collection system and the Marana treatment plant. There was currently a standoff between the three parties. The City had told Marana that if they wanted to be on their own, then they could take the water system from the City of Tucson, pay for the investment the City had put into it, but they would not be provided any water, under any conditions, from the City.

5. Summary: FY 2007 Financial Results

David Cormier, Tucson Water Business Services Administrator, distributed a handout and gave a presentation on the Preliminary FY 2007 Fiscal Year End Financial Results. The issues discussed were revenue sources for FY 2007 being around four million dollars less than in FY 2006 and various revenues involved including potable water sales revenue results, growth rates, reclaimed water sales, as well as reclaimed projections and net.

Chair Boyle asked Mr. Cormier to comment about revenues for the first two months of the 2008 fiscal year. Mr. Cormier replied they were pretty much on target in all areas. Barbara Buus spoke about the first two month revenues and the forecast involved.

Mr Cormier continued his presentation with a review of the FY 2007 Operations and Management spending on Attachment B of the handout.

Chair Boyle asked Mr. Cormier to send more information regarding "Other Services" and "Commodities" as they were the categories that had the largest

amount of overspending.

Mr. Cormier continued his presentation with a review of Attachment C, Tucson Water's FY 2007 Capital Expenditures. Mr. Modeer added there would be a difference between budget forecasts and actual operating costs.

Committee Member Kramer asked if Tucson Water was affected by increased construction costs. Mr. Modeer said they were. He added commodity and construction bid prices had increased substantially in the last few years.

Committee Member Zimmerman questioned the infrastructure reserve in the report. Mr. Modeer replied that this came out of the settlements with Oro Valley and Metro Water over the Northwest area agreement going back 10 years or more. She asked further regarding infrastructure assets to which Mr. Modeer replied that it could be anything in infrastructure, that it was not limited to pipes, it could be any type of replacement infrastructure. Committee Member Zimmerman asked if Tucson Water's projects were assigned. Mr. Modeer responded they had not gone into the CIP in a significant way in the last couple of years because they had focused on CAP infrastructure facilities, which the funds were not established for. Funds were established for infrastructure replacement. To go in and use those would mean a much higher CIP and they would be used in the future.

Committee Member Lustig spoke about the finance sub-committee covering those costs and funds being used in an emergency situation.

Mr. Modeer replied regarding the ten million dollars in that fund could be used for it. It was a decision of how high the CIP would be. In making a decision to invest in infrastructure or invest in the CAP, the decision made by everyone was to invest in the CAP. When they reviewed the CIP they would see a significantly elevated CIP program in the next five years which was almost entirely related to the CAP facilities in Avra Valley.

If they spent money on infrastructure replacement there would be two major issues. One, there would be a larger rate increase to fund revenues, even though there was a reserve fund, it would still need to be in the budget. It would increase capacity problems to deal with the issue. Secondly, they were not sure they had engineering staff to do both projects simultaneously to get things completed within their timeframe. It was a capacity issue, how much they could do and spend.

8. a. Rate Calendar (Note: This item taken out of order)

Trucynda Hawkins, Tucson Water Management Coordinator distributed a handout on this topic and explained the initial rate calendar involved three sequential steps in the following order:

- The financial plan

- Projected revenue
- Existing rates

Ms. Hawkins explained these items needed to be in place before they could move on to the next steps of the rate process which were revenue targets and rate design. Once these had been established, it would be reviewed by everyone then would go back to Mayor and Council for formal adoption.

Ms. Hawkins also reminded everyone that CWAC was scheduled to vote on their recommendation of the financial plan. She said they would keep a dialogue with the Mayor and Council Members and staff, and they hoped they could meet the projected dates. Ultimately, they wanted the rates to be effective as of July 7, 2008.

Committee Member Barry commented that he was pleased to see so much interaction with the City Manager's Office. He mentioned the two issues CWAC would vote on were the financial plan on December 5, 2007, and revenue targets and rate design on March 5, 2008. This gave CWAC members ample time to review the materials involved in the rate process.

Committee Member Carhuff observed that between November 7, 2007, and December 5, 2007, CWAC would have had the CIP and the operating budget for review. As this was a critical thirty day period, Tucson Water staff would be available to answer questions from CWAC members about those details.

Chair Boyle added the finance subcommittee meeting dates would be announced and made available to committee members and members of the public. The meetings were open to whomever was interested in attending.

8.b. Meeting Date changes (Note: this item taken out of order)

Chair Boyle announced the following changes to three upcoming CWAC meeting dates:

- From Wednesday, October 3, 2007 to Wednesday, October 10, 2007
- From Wednesday, January 2, 2008 to Wednesday, January 9, 2008
- From Wednesday, February 6, 2008 to Wednesday, February 13, 2008

6. Requested FY 2009 – FY 2013 CIP Budget

David Cormier gave a summary covering:

- An overview of the 5 Year Capital Budget
- Related projects
- Breakdown of the use of 2005 bond authorization

Mr. Cormier distributed three handouts relating to this item. He announced the South Avra Valley Storage and Recovery Project (SAVSARP) and roadway projects were the two major projects comprising the five year CIP budget.

Sandy Elder, Tucson Water Administrator, noted there were sixty new CIP projects with about twenty-eight provisions to existing projects totaling five hundred fifty-four million dollars over a five year period. The sixty new CIP projects included main replacements, improvements to existing transmission mains, and improvements to existing reservoirs. Unfortunately, they could not do them all and they had to be incorporated into their existing projects since CAVSARP and SAVSARP were their priorities. They were encouraging staff to schedule cash flow by projecting what costs would be and getting better time estimates when costs would occur. He said they had to categorize CIP Projects by resource, structure, development, general plan growth, regulatory and safety issues attributes, and impact of liability issues.

Pat Eisenberg, Tucson Water Administrator, explained the FY 2009 – FY 2013 Capital Budget handout outlined the funds necessary to get CAP water into the ground, out of the ground, into the reservoirs, and into the system. The other funds were for other essential roadway modifications that had to be done, upgrading the SCADA system, and the meter replacement and upgrade program.

Ms. Eisenberg said the second handout explained the CIP projects in backlog falling into development and growth, general, infrastructure, resource, SCADA, and reclaimed categories. The handout outlined projects they planned to do but were unable to do all at the same time.

Committee Member Evans asked what cathodic protection was. Ms. Eisenberg explained it was the process used to protect pipes from corrosion. She explained Tucson Water would monitor and try to prevent the progress corrosion to the pipes. Mr. Modeer added that corrosion of any type meant metal molecules were leaving that pipe to go someplace else. What happened underground was that acidic soil conditions made metal molecules attach to something else, or it could occur if other entities who used metal pipes were using cathodic protection to protect the integrity of their pipes and it caused corrosion to Tucson Water's pipes.

Committee Member Gentzler asked Mr. Modeer how critical the limited in-house engineering staff to oversee some of these improvements was. He wanted to know if this was a problem that could be solved by adding engineering staff. Mr. Modeer replied that Tucson Water was staffed to handle what they were budgeted for and they had to plan carefully to have the appropriate amount of staff to meet Tucson Water's needs.

Committee Member Canfield asked about the 6.4 million dollar meter replacement cost in the five year capital budget. Sandy Elder said they were on target and Pat Eisenberg added this reflected a continued level of spending of slightly over one million dollars a year. Mr. Modeer said they would probably have to increase spending for meter replacement since more meters in the system would need to be replaced as they aged. Discussion followed regarding the impact of age, meter flows, and meter size on meter accuracy.

Committee Member Kramer asked if the arsenic project was a result of new water quality standards. Mr. Modeer answered affirmatively and said the water

was below the standard at the point of entry

Committee Member Kramber asked how critical projects presently on the delay list were being prioritized and what were the limitations of what could be included in the five year versus the long term project lists. Ms. Eisenberg responded the engineering staff worked with maintenance design staff to determine which were problem areas. They developed their plans when funds were available and they were done when they could be.

Committee Member Carhuff had a similar concern regarding the millions in infrastructure projects that were postponed. Mr. Modeer explained that this did not degrade the reliability of the system and CWAC could make a different recommendation. Tucson Water had tried to be cognizant of the overall five year plan impacts and the desire of CWAC, Mayor and Council, and the City Manager to get the city's CAP allocation into use.

Committee Member Carhuff asked whether there was any way to do an analysis of what would have been the annual capital cost of the forty-five million dollars versus the increased operations and maintenance cost by not taking the annual capital costs. Pat Eisenberg replied that a study was being conducted and these were predictable maintenance and could be expected based on current rates which were currently being tracked. Mr. Modeer added this was increasing the amount of maintenance required and it was stretching staff thin, creating difficulties in making repairs, and broadening the areas needing to be shut down for repairs. One of the biggest issues that Tucson Water had in the maintenance area was valves that could not be found that were buried or valves that did not work.

Committee Member Evans asked what was the process of working with other utilities to increase the efficiencies of corrosion protection. Ray Wilson, Tucson Water Administrator, responded that Tucson Water had a water corrosion expert named Paul Costa. He kept in contact with Southwest Gas, Metro Water, and anyone involved in underground utilities that would affect pipelines.

Committee Member Barry said it would help if they could take another cut at the CIP and see how much of it related to pure growth, how much related to growth and to the existing system, and how much was just for the existing system. Sandy Elder said the projects in development and growth categories were mostly the reservoirs on the southeast side of town.

Chair Boyle noted the principal subject of the upcoming Finance Committee Meetings on September 6, and September 12, 2007 would be the CIP.

David Cormier said CWAC would consider the Financial Plan in December 2007, but CWAC would not consider the CIP separate of the financial plan.

8.c. Potential CWAC Agenda for 2007-2008 (Memo from Jim Barry, Vice Chair)

Committee Member Barry distributed a handout covering his meeting with Committee Member Canfield, chair of the Education and Conservation

subcommittee, Committee Member Carhuff, chair of the Finance subcommittee, and Committee Member Zimmerman, chair of the Technical Planning and Policy subcommittee, regarding possible agenda items for CWAC from September 2007, until June 2008. They discussed items that concerned Tucson Water's future and what CWAC should be addressing, including a series of presentations to CWAC to build their knowledge base and expertise such as:

- The 2008 Rate Process, which they had already discussed.
- Proposition 200
- Water Plant #1, which would come back in October 2007.

Mr. Barry said the remaining items to be considered for the 2007-08 CWAC agendas were:

- Water supply and knowledge of drought issues
- New water sources
- Unaccounted for water
- Leak management
- Financial issues and impact fees
- Cost of utility relocation
- New bond election
- Water treatment options
- Potential CIP costs
- Regionalization

Chair Boyle said that the idea was to get all the sub-committee chairs together to come up with a framework of what issues were to be covered over the next 12 months.

9. Sub-committee Reports

Committee Member Zimmerman reported the Technical Planning & Policy subcommittee did not meet but would meet later in the month.

Evan Canfield said the Education and Conservation subcommittee did not have a meeting but would meet later in September 2007 to discuss the Citizens Conservation Task Force.

John Carhuff noted that the Finance subcommittee met the previous week to discuss the CIP and submitted questions to staff and would address the issues at their meeting on September 6, 2007.

9.a. Appreciation to Keith Gentzler, outgoing CWAC member

Committee Member Gentzler had resigned from CWAC due to other commitments. Chair Boyle expressed his gratitude for Committee Member Gentzler's contributions over the years and gave him a small memento as a token of their appreciation.

Mr. Modeer also expressed his appreciation to Committee Member Gentzler and presented Mr. Gentzler with a book and a plaque from Tucson Water.

Mr. Gentzler thanked everyone and said it had been a real pleasure working with CWAC and especially with the staff.

7. Proposition 200 (Note: this item taken out of order)

Mr. Modeer began the discussion explaining that everyone was aware of an initiative, which was certified for placement on the November 2007 ballot. It was called Proposition 200, titled the Tucson Water Bill of Rights. As staff and part of the City structure, they could speak to the facts of this initiative but were not able to speak to whether it should or should not be supported.

Mr. Modeer began a discussion on the major issues imbedded in the initiative and what its factual impact would be on the City of Tucson and briefly spoke about what Tucson Water had done internally with regard to frequently asked questions on the subject.

One question that had come up a lot was whether Proposition 200 limited growth and ensured sustainable supply of water in the Tucson region. Mr. Modeer replied categorically that it did not limit growth; it only prevented growth inside the Tucson Water service area. Growth would continue even if Tucson Water were not involved. It would be pushed into the outer areas of the community and would foster the sprawl issue and would deplete the ground water resources in this region to a significant extent and limit Tucson Water's abilities to use ground water in the future. It would affect sustainable water supply and would not stop growth.

Another question raised was the issue of toilet-to-tap. The City of Tucson has never proposed toilet-to-tap. To the contrary, toilet to tap was outlawed in Arizona under administrative code. This prohibited the directing of treated effluent into a potable water system. The only use of effluent in a potable system that was allowed in Arizona was the surface recharge of A+ effluent and then eventually re-pumped out somewhere as recovered ground water. Tucson Water could not even do that in Tucson because the effluent in Tucson is not A+. The plus on it means it was de-nitrified and effluent in the Tucson region was not de-nitrified although it was in the County's plans for the future. Hence, toilet to tap was never proposed; what has been said in the long-range plans was that effluent was a valuable resource that needed to be protected and preserved for the future. It may be needed for augmentation of potable supply by advanced treatment and recharge in the aquifer. This was never an issue and was not actually allowed in Arizona.

The matter of whether Proposition 200 limited the use of reclaimed water was raised. Mr. Modeer replied that it did. It limited it to irrigation only and only to an extent to keep the vegetation alive. The only other use was to put it into the river. Effluent could not be used for fire suppression, dust control, toilet flushing, or any other use one would want to put reclaimed water to was prohibited by the initiative. It would require Tucson Water to dispose of a valuable resource

without putting it to potential positive uses that could be developed in the future. He added there was no danger of running out of a sustainable water supply. Tucson had received its assured water supply during the summer months. He reiterated that there was no crisis in finding sustainable supplies; the right decisions and plans just needed to be made. Tucson was not running out of sustainable water supplies.

Mr. Modeer said Tucson would not lose its access to water as indicated in the initiative if a shortage was declared on the Colorado River. The shortage criteria that had been proposed and would be approved in some format once issues were resolved was a staged shortage on the river. This provided that the shortage would be shared between Nevada, Mexico, and Arizona from a 400,000 acre-feet in the first, to the third stage of 600,000 acre-feet but it was not estimated to hit municipal supplies for twenty-five to thirty years if they stayed in shortage that long. He added if a drought continued beyond twenty-five to thirty years, no one could say what would happen to any supply. The probabilities of Tucson's shortage in the best case scenario of flow in the River were by the year 2011, which was the middle range case. The best case was about 2015. The worst case scenario of flows on the River was about 2009. These were model runs done by the Bureau and the Central Arizona Project. It was not going to impact Tucson's supplies for the foreseeable future even if a shortage was declared. The issue for Tucson was the contracts between the subcontractors, like the City of Tucson and the federal government, who had a clause that said if a shortage was declared on the River, access to contracted water would be limited to that used in the previous year. Tucson did not want to be in the position to be limited to the 80,000 acre-feet and be limited to that for a twenty year period; the City must make certain it was buying all of their CAP water prior to the declaration of a shortage on the river. The initiative said all connections stopped immediately when a shortage was declared even though there had been no impact upon the water supply in Tucson. The most likely case would be by 2011 or 2012. A shortage would not directly impact Tucson's water supply.

Mr. Modeer said the Proposition significantly affected regional cooperation. The initiative said Tucson could not provide water to any other water provider, which meant that Tucson was prevented from supplying water that was currently supplied to entities that were listed as water providers by the Arizona Department of Water Resources. These included the University of Arizona, the Veterans Administration, and some trailer parks. It limited Tucson Water's ability to assist other water providers only in an emergency and only for ten days. The proposition limited Tucson Water's ability to provide water and it would not be able to enter into cooperative agreements to "wheel" CAP water and provide it back to other agencies. This would be a definite negative aspect to its ability as a water provider to cooperate with other entities within the region.

Committee Member Lustig asked a question regarding this supply of water to other water providers. Mr. Modeer replied that they were in communication with the University of Arizona, the Veterans Administration, and other entities to whom they provided water. Upon passage of this initiative, it is likely these would no longer be provided water. Committee Member Lustig asked if these entities were making other arrangements to go elsewhere and if they had other options. Mr.

Modeer said that the VA went to Tucson Water's system from their own system because of arsenic and TCE contamination in the area. The University of Arizona was not equipped any longer to provide the full water supply they did in the past when they were smaller and they had all their wells active. Their well supplies were substantially less than what they were ten or fifteen years ago. They had relied on the City's water supply for the last ten years or so. This initiative would have a big impact on the University of Arizona. Mr. Modeer did not know what the options of the VA or other entities were yet. They would be contacted to assess what their options would be.

Mr. Modeer said that with regard to the twenty three million dollars in environmental service fees, the City would have to go back to the general fund. The impacted areas would be up to the Mayor and Council to decide but that he could not address this although it would take twenty three million dollars out of the revenue stream.

Vice-Chair Barry interjected to say that if this initiative passed then Mayor and Council and the City Manager had the issue of raising or requesting this twenty three million dollars to make up these funds. The money would have to be found somewhere.

Chair Boyle opened up the floor to any questions and comments. He asked Chris Avery, Assistant City Attorney, to comment on what limitations were placed on CWAC members.

Chris Avery spoke about the members of CWAC as individuals and as a whole with regard to official representation and membership in the organization. All members could reference their membership in CWAC as a credential entitling each to say he or she is a member, having been asked to serve on CWAC because of familiarity with water issues. However, the members were not able to say that CWAC membership had formally taken a position on the initiative. Members were entitled as individual members or as a group not meeting in an official capacity to say that, as members of CWAC, they were opposed or in favor of this issue. However, CWAC was not allowed to pass a resolution saying CWAC formally opposed or supported this issue.

Committee Member Canfield asked about writing a letter to the editor expressing their views. Chris Avery replied that a letter to the editor from CWAC or on CWAC or Committee letterhead was okay if individual members or as a group expressed an opinion. As long as it was not a formal CWAC position, anyone was entitled to express an opinion. Members' credentials could be used as CWAC members in expressing opinions.

Committee Member Gentzler encouraged the committee not to give up on regionalization.

Vice-Chair Barry asked if CWAC members could place an ad in the Daily Star stating their position and sign their names and titles.

Chris Avery replied that they could do this and state they are CWAC members.

They could not, however, take a position adopted by CWAC. Individual members could take this action on an informal basis.

Committee Member Zimmerman spoke about her campaign against Proposition 200, which was actively underway. Mr. Avery reiterated that CWAC was not entitled to take a formal position. She then noted what the campaign had been doing adding that the web site: www.200.org could be accessed.

Chair Boyle then asked when early voting started. Committee Member Zimmerman replied that ballots could be obtained by mid-October.

Vice-Chair Barry asked what a reasonable expectation of voter turnout would be. Committee Member Zimmerman replied that the number of thirty to thirty-five percent was a good estimate.

In response to this question, Committee Member Carhuff asked what public information was available on this subject.

Mr. Modeer replied that Tucson Water's Public Information office or the City Manager could be contacted to speak to a group such as a city club or neighborhood association. If it concerned the garbage fee issue, the Environmental Services Director, Andy Quigley, could come or all of them together. They had already received a number of requests that had been scheduled.

Committee Member Carhuff asked if the information on this issue was available on line. Mr. Modeer replied that it would be up on the City's web site and on Tucson Water's web site once it was completed. The City was producing a brochure related to frequently asked questions which would be available to the general public and likely be completed in the next couple of weeks.

Chair Boyle said a preliminary FAQ would be sent to CWAC members. He asked if there would be any opportunity for debate between the sponsors of Proposition 200 and the people opposed to it.

Committee Member Zimmerman replied that there already have been and that John Kromko was scheduled to speak again on this matter.

10. Call to the Audience

No one spoke.

11. Adjournment 9:03 a.m.